

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-4, 7, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin et al. (US 6,271,903) in view of Kim (US 6,177,970).

Claim 5, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin et al. in view of Kim ('970) and Kim et al. (US 6,388,727).

Claims 1 and 4 are objected to because of a minor informality.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claim 1 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-5, 7-8, 19, and 20 are presently pending.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 4 are objected to because of a minor informality. Accordingly, claims 1 and 4 have been amended to recite the "thin" film transistor. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claims 1 and 4 be withdrawn.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-4, 7, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin et al. (US 6,271,903) in view of Kim (US 6,177,970), and claims 5, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin et al. in view of Kim ('970) and Kim et al. (US 6,388,727). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for at least the following reasons.

Initially, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Final Office Action fails to properly address each and every feature recited by independent claim 4, as amended in the Amendment filed on November 21, 2005. Specifically, the Final Office Action fails to address or show in

any of the applied prior art references where the claimed features of “the alignment film directly contacts upper and side surfaces of the common line, upper and side surfaces of the pixel electrode, *and upper surfaces of the source and drain electrodes of the thin film transistor*,” (emphasis added), is either taught or suggested by any of Shin et al., Kim (‘970), and/or Kim et al. (‘727). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that Applicant’s claimed invention has not been given proper examination, and thus, the present amendments should be entered in order for the Examiner to fairly provide Applicant with a proper examination of the claimed invention, as presented in the Amendment filed on November 21, 2005, as well as re-presented herein.

With respect to independent claims 1 and 4, Applicant respectfully asserts that the applied art, whether taken singly or combined, do not teach or suggest a combination including an alignment film “directly contacting...upper surfaces of the source and drain electrodes of the thin film transistor.” In direct contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention, Shin et al. is completely silent with regard to an alignment film directly contacting source and drain electrodes, and Kim (‘970) explicitly teaches forming an alignment film 90 deliberately spaced apart from source and drain electrodes 710 and 720 by an intervening protection insulating layer 80. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that Shin et al. and Kim (‘970), whether taken singly or combined, fail to teach or suggest the combination of features recited by independent claim 1, as presently amended, and independent claim 4, as presented in the Amendment filed on November 21, 2005. Thus, the Final Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to independent claims 1 and 4, and hence dependent claims 2, 3, 7, and 8.

In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Final Office Action fails to rely upon Kim et al. ('727) to remedy the deficiencies of Shin et al. ('903) and/or Kim ('970). Moreover, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Final Office Action cannot rely upon Kim et al. ('727) to remedy the deficiencies of Shin et al. ('903) and/or Kim ('970) since Kim et al. ('727) fails to teach or suggest an alignment film directly contacting upper surfaces of source and drain electrodes of a thin film transistor.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection of claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be withdrawn. In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent claims 2-3, 5, 7, 8, 19, and 20 are allowable at least because of the respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 4 and for the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: Mary Jane Boswell
Mary Jane Boswell
Reg. No. 33,652

Dated: May 8, 2006

Customer Number: 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
(202)739-3000